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# Introduction

The WID for Rel-17 enhancements for NB-IoT and LTE-MTC [1] includes an objective to support 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL in NB-IoT.

* *Specify 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL, including necessary changes to DL power allocation for NPDSCH and DL TBS. This is to be specified without a new NB-IoT UE category. For DL, increase in maximum TBS of e.g. 2x the Rel-16 maximum, and soft buffer size will be specified by modifying at least existing Category NB2. For UL, the maximum TBS is not increased. [NB-IoT] [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Extend the NB-IoT channel quality reporting based on the framework of Rel-14—16, to support 16-QAM in DL. [NB-IoT] [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4]*

This documents provides the proposals and summary of discussions of the corresponding email discussion according to the inputs [2-10].

[106-e-LTE-Rel17\_NB\_IoT\_eMTC-01] Email discussion on support of 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL for NB-IoT – Yubo (Huawei)

# Discussion

## Applicability

### Issue 1: Applicability

The following has been achieved in online discussion:

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

* Working Assumption
  + Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure.

On the support of 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure, it seems several companies can accept 16-QAM for PUR NPDSCH, if no further enhancement for CQI during PUR procedure. The following is proposed:

Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure

* CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure
* The power ratios between NRS and NPDSCH is pre-configured for NPDSCH in PUR procedure

With the support of 16-QAM for PUR NPUSCH, companies (Nokia, NSB, QC) proposed the corresponding enhancement on the configuration of PUR, therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 2: To support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**

* **One RRC IE is introduced in *pur-PhysicalConfig* to enable the use of 16-QAM.**
  + **When 16-QAM is enabled, the RRC IE *multiTone* in *npusch-MCS* in *pur-PhysicalConfig* indicates the TBS indices for 16-QAM.**

Please input your comments on the above proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson v010 | * Proposal 1: Even if the CSI report were not supported, other DL related elements would have to be pre-configured such as data-to-pilot power ratios, and MCS ranges. If after truly pondering the importance of the DL use-case (recall 64 QAM in DL was not supported for PUR) versus the specification impacts, the interest still prevails, then aiming at being constructive we could accept proposal 1 subject to have an agreement stating that: “*Two new optional IEs for DL and UL 16QAM are introduced in the PUR configuration*”. The above as to be able to control DL and UL separately in PUR.      * Proposal 2: It seems that extending the RRC IE *multiTone* is not needed, since the following approach will allow to save bits.   **To support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**   * One RRC IE is introduced in *pur-PhysicalConfig* to enable the use of 16-QAM.   + When 16-QAM is enabled, the RRC IE *multiTone* in npusch-MCS in *pur-PhysicalConfig* indicates MCS from 14 to 21. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Proposal 1.  On Proposal 2, our original proposal was to only extend the multiTone field for UE capable of 16-QAM (i.e. no need to enable the use of 16-QAM separately). However, we have no strong view and can also accept Ericsson’s proposal to introduce two optional IEs. |
| MTK | We are ok with Proposa1 and prefer the modified proposal2 from Ericsson. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For proposal 2 the detailed signaling can be up to RAN2. We are also fine with proposal 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For proposal1, we can compromise to accept this proposal unless there is no any further optimization.  For proposal2, alternatively, a new 5bits field, e.g., ***multiTone-r17***, can also be used for enabling 16-QAM and corresponding MCS value. We think it is up to RAN2 decision. |
| Moderator | On comments from Ericsson, for NPDSCH in PUR procedure, the MCS is not pre-configured but scheduled from DCI, so this new IE is not needed.  Regarding the comments, proposals are updated as below:  Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure   * CSI report is not supported/expected during PUR procedure * The power ratios between NRS and NPDSCH is pre-configured for NPDSCH in PUR procedure   **Proposal 2: To support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**   * **One RRC IE is introduced in *pur-PhysicalConfig* to enable the use of 16-QAM.**   + **When 16-QAM is enabled, the RRC IE *multiTone* in npusch-MCS in *pur-PhysicalConfig* indicates the TBS indices for 16-QAM.** |
| Ericsson v016 | In my understanding there are elements of DL that somehow need to be pre-configured. If it is not the case, then why your proposal 1 includes the “power ratios … for NPDSCH in PUR procedure”???  That is why, if 16-QAM in UL and DL is to be supported in PUR, we can be ok with it subject to have “*Two new optional IEs for DL and UL 16QAM are introduced in the PUR configuration*”. The above as to be able to control DL and UL separately in PUR. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Whether to introduce a new RRC IE or reuse the RRC IE is up to RAN2 decision.  Modify the proposal 2 as following:   1. **QAM for PUR can be enabled/disabled by UE specific RRC signalling.**  * **when 16-QAM for PUR is enabled, TBS for PUR can be indicated by UE specific RRC signalling** |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with Proposal 1.  On Proposal 2, we have similar view / preference as ZTE that the ***multitone*** field can be used. But we have no strong preference here so we could also accept the proposal if that is the majority view. |

## DCI

### Issue 2: DCI design

The following have been achieved:

Confirm the working assumption:

Working Assumption

For the indication of 16-QAM in uplink

* The “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized as in legacy for scheduling QPSK.
* One reserved state in the “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the use of 16QAM.
* The “Repetition number” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the TBS indices (i.e., I\_TBS indices from 14 to 21) for 16-QAM in UL.

Agreement

**For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB.**

Regarding the comments that inbandCarrierInfo can also be in Msg3, maybe we can have a proposal to correct it as below:

**Proposal 3: the agreement below is updated as**

Agreement

**For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* ~~in SIB~~.**

Please input your comments regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson v016 | Due that “*operationModeInfo*” refers to “MIB”, proposal 3 looks asymmetrical. We do not see the problem in just adding “/msg4” as to have “*inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB/msg4”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We do not need to change the agreement. Just add a new agreement to capture msg4 is fine.  **For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier also can be signaled by *inbandCarrierInfo* in UE-specific RRC signalling.** |
| Nokia, NSB | We think it’s better to add clarification text as proposed by Ericsson rather than to delete “in SIB”. |

## Power allocation and power control

### Issue 3: downlink power allocation

The following has been achieved:

**Confirm working assumption:**

Working Assumption

For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:

* For standalone and guard-band deployments:
  + One power ratio is signaled optionally
    - NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS
  + The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols.
  + If the signalling is not indicated, the legacy power allocation is used.
    - i.e., the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE is 0dB for one NRS antenna port, and -3dB for two NRS antenna ports
* UE specific signalling is used

For inband, there’s still following two alternatives:

* For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”. Down-select from the following options in RAN1#106-e:
  + Alt 1:
    - The existing parameter nrs-CRS-PowerOffset is reused for same PCI case, and is signaled for different PCI case.
    - The same transmit power of different symbols is assumed as to derive from *nrs-CRS-PowerOffset* the NPDSCH EPRE in symbols with CRS.
  + Alt 2:
    - the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signaled

For inband, one company (QC) raised a concern over Alt-1. As illustrated in the following figures, the CRS, NRS and NPDSCH are power boosted by 3dB compared to LTE PDSCH, i.e., the linear transmit power is 2. The calculated power is shown in Figure 1, which is different with the actual transmission power as shown in Figure 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure 1 Power allocation under Alt.1 (red: CRS, yellow: NPDSCH, green: NRS) – showing only a single symbol of each type**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | Figure 3 Correct power allocation over 2 PRBs, where the PDSCH in LTE PRB is “blanked” and the corresponding power is allocated to NB-IoT NPDSCH/NRS   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NB-IoT PRB | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | “Blanked” LTE PRB | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Figure 2 Nominal power allocation for an RB with PDSCH (red: CRS, orange: PDSCH)   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | |

**Proposal 4: For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:**

* **For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”. Down-select from the following options in RAN1#106-e:** 
  + **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled**
  + **the signalling is UE specific**

Please input your comments to the concern over Alt-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 6. For in-band deployment we support Alt-2, and we share similar concern with QC over Alt-1 for in-band DL power allocation. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 6: Ok with confirming the WA.  For In-band, in our understanding some companies seem to think that Alt-2 does not include the assumption on “The same transmit power of different symbols is assumed” and for that reason they seem to be leaning towards Alt-1, however, the assumption made for “Stand-alone and Guard-band” where “The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols” applies for in-band deployments indeed the agreement for In-band deployments already states how the signalling for stand-alone and guard-band (assumption included) is applied in the in-band case:  *“… the signaling for standalone and guard-band deployments … in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”*”  Thus, for the in-band case, we believe is sufficient to agree on the following:  For the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in “In-band deployments”, Alt-2 is selected:   * The power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signaled. * UE specific signaling is used |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We still prefer Alt-1  For NBIoT carrier (within 1PRB bandwidth), if different symbols have different receiving power, there will be some performance loss due to improper AGC for UE side.  For QC’s concern, symbol 2 EPRE is signalled by higher layer, symbol 3 EPRE should be derived by assuming the same transmit power between 2 and 3. However, there will be different transmit power for symbol 1 and 2. It seems the design is not aligned.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NB-IoT PRB | 2 | 2 | 2 | |  |  |  | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 6. For in-band deployment, we support Alt-1 to ensure that guardband/standalone and inband deployments have the same assumption with the same transmit power across different symbols. For the mentioned concern on Alt 1, increasing the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS(agreed) can increase the absolute NPDSCH EPRE of all OFDM symbols to meet decoding requirements. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support proposal 6 |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 6 is OK.  For in-band, let us reply to some of the comments:  “However, there will be different transmit power for symbol 1 and 2. It seems the design is not aligned.”  The transmit power in symbols 1 and 2 are indeed different if you only take into account the NBIOT PRB. If you add the other PRB we show in our contribution, the power is constant (that’s the whole point).  “we support Alt-1 to ensure that guardband/standalone and inband deployments have the same assumption with the same transmit power across different symbols”  The issue with inband is that the eNB cannot “blank” the CRS in the other PRBs, so if CRS is power boosted, NPDSCH needs to be correspondingly de-boosted to keep constant power across the wideband LTE carrier. |
| Moderator | As there’s no further response regarding QC’s elaboration, the concern that for LTE the transmit power between different symbols should be same and the CRS power should be constant within LTE bandwidth, the following is proposed:   * For inband deployments, a power ratio is signaled in addition to the signalling for standalone and guard-band deployments which in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”. Down-select from the following options in RAN1#106-e:   + the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signalled   + the signalling is UE specific |
| Ericsson v016 | We are Ok with proposal 4, you just need to remove the text “Down-select from the options in RAN1#016-e:” |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If there are multiple UEs(NB-IoT UE and LTE UE) are scheduled in the same subframe, the power for CRS boosting can be borrowed from LTE PDSCH power. In this case, the NPDSCH power does not need to be de-boosted. |

### Issue 4: uplink power control

Regarding the options proposed for uplink power control,

* Option 1: Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.
* Option 2: is given in table based on MCS index if enabled, 0 otherwise.
* Option 3: A TPC command is introduce to indicate the power offset for NPUSCH with 16-QAM.
* Option 4: is configured by high layer parameter.
* Option 5: ΔTF = for *Ks* = 1.25 or ΔTF = 0 for *Ks* = 0, where BPRE =. is the highest code rate in the TBS/MCS table used for the Modulation Scheme, and is the number of bits per M-ary symbol of the Modulation Scheme.

The following has been achieved:

Agreement

Down-select one option from Cat 1 as starting point

* Cat 1: Option 1, Option 2/Option 4, Option 5

FFS Cat 2: Option 3, for close-loop power control

Please input your preference and reasons on the down-selection, and your comments on the FFS as well:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 7 and support option 1, since it is sufficient to follow the LTE principle and seems no need to introduce a different one. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 7:  Question on Option 1, what is the actual result we are getting with option 1?  For Option 5, it is not mentioned that it also re-uses the LTE’s definition, the only simplification is on *BPRE*, which is made dependent on the code rate and modulation scheme as follows: *BPRE* =. Then to determine ΔTF, we calculate first the TF for QPSK and then TF for 16-QAM as to obtain the difference between them (i.e., ΔTF):  TFQPSK = = = 5.9379 dB  TF16-QAM = = = 13.1924 dB  ΔTF = TF16-QAM - TFQPSK = 7.2545 dB  For Option 4, I believe the configured value is selected from a set containing at least a few of possible configurable values, in that case probably is better to add the following: “Option 4: is configured by high layer parameter, 0 otherwise. FFS: values in the set from which is chosen.” |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are OK with proposal 7 and support option 1, since it is sufficient to follow the LTE principle and seems no need to introduce a different one. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 7 and support option3. A TPC command can provide flexible power control. Because the CQI is report ed by MAC CE and NB-IoT UE is a kind of low cost UE, the complicated calculation for ΔTF is not appropriate for NB-IoT. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with proposal 7. Our preference is option 2, which is a simplified version of option 1/5. |
| Qualcomm | We think Option 3 should be removed. The other options can be further discussed. |
| Ericsson v010 | We kindly request the proponent of Option 1 to provide the numeric value obtained from ΔTF.  For Option 5, ΔTF = 7.2545 dB.  An equation-based solution as Option 1 and Option 5 provides a single ΔTF value. Thus, we think that is probably better to have more flexibility through a ΔTF configured via HL (e.g., Option 4), where ΔTF is selected from among a set of possible values in a set. For example:  ΔTF = {A*dB*, B*dB*, C*dB*, D*dB*} is provided by HL parameter, and if this field is absent then 0*dB* will be used.   * FFS: A, B, C, D.   With the above approach, the resulting ΔTF from e.g., Option 1, Option 5 could be included in the set, which provides flexibility. |
| Nokia, NSB | We think that a single value per MCS level defined in specifications should be sufficient. There is no need to computer the value for each allocation nor have multiple higher-layer configured values. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The specific value is calculated based on for . And for . is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size. is the number of REs for NPUSCH. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A repurposed field with 4 bits can be used for TPC command. There are enough states to include all power offset determined by . We do not see any benefits to adopt the , instead of dynamic TPC control. |

## Channel quality reporting

### Issue 5: Channel quality reporting

As most companies propose to not support channel quality report in Msg3 in connected mode, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 8 (conclusion): The channel quality report is not supported in Msg3 in connected mode in Rel-17.**

On the CQI table for downlink 16-QAM, 4 companies (Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Moto) prefer option 1, 1 company (Ericsson) prefers option 2, and 7 companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sanechips, MTK) prefer option 3.

The concerns to support option 1 include: limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting, “dB” step size granularity, increased size of legacy table, no backward compatible, and more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH.

The concerns to support option 2 include: large SNR gap between NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16QAM TBS, more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH, and limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting.

The concerns to support option 3 include: no backward compatible, and additional signaling.

For the majority view (option 3), the concerns can be easily addressed by a Rel-17 RRC parameter. If it can be resolved, the following is proposed to move forward based on majority view:

**Proposal 9: For downlink 16-QAM, a new CQI table is defined based on the table 7.2.3-3 in TS 36.213 as a starting point.**

Please input your comments for the above proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 8 and proposal 9. |
| Ericsson | * Proposal 8: Ok. * Proposal 9: We are not ok with it, mainly because of the no backward compatibility from option 1 and option 3. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are OK with proposal 8  For proposal 9, we have some concern because it is not aligned with the WID  If we use new CQI table, I am not sure which part of the new CQI reporting follows the framework of CQI reporting in Rel.14-16.   * Specify 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL, including necessary changes to DL power allocation for NPDSCH and DL TBS. This is to be specified without a new NB-IoT UE category. For DL, increase in maximum TBS of e.g. 2x the Rel-16 maximum, and soft buffer size will be specified by modifying at least existing Category NB2. For UL, the maximum TBS is not increased. [NB-IoT] [RAN1, RAN4]   + Extend the NB-IoT channel quality reporting based on the framework of Rel-14—16, to support 16-QAM in DL. [NB-IoT] [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] |
| MTK | For proposal 8, we follow majorities, ok with it. We are also ok with proposal9, regardging Lenovo,MotoM’ concern, the reporting is still a 4-bits table like legacy Release, from the view of framework, we think it doesn’t violate it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 8 and 9. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Proposal 9. For Proposal 8, although we feel that channel quality reporting in Msg3 would be beneficial, we are OK to proceed with majority view. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Others

**Issue 6: Others**

Based on previous comments, there are two companies proposing to discuss the CSI reference. Therefore, the following is proposed for discussion:

**Proposal 10: Define CSI reference resource to be used for 16-QAM CQI measurement.**

Please input your comments to the above proposal or any other issue that can be considered for discussion in this meeting:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson v010 | We need to define reference symbols to estimate CQI, NRS seems to be suitable for this purpose in NB-IoT. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support this proposal. It can be based on NRS with similar definition as for eMTC. |
| MTK | Considering the limited resource, We think it’s better to follow legacy measurement framework (NRS based as well). Definite CSI reference resource might introduce extra latency compared to instant moving-average measurement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In channel quality reporting in R16, no reference resource is defined for measurement in the spec. We think there is no need to define this and can follow the legacy. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In the frequency domain, the UE can only measure CQI based on one PRB where UE monitors NPDCCH and the associated NPDSCH. In the time domain, whether to use a single subframe or multiple subframes to measure CQI can be based on UE implementation. In addition, RAN1 has not defined measurement reference resource for channel quality report in Rel-14/16 NB-IoT. Thus, the measurement reference resource does not need to be specified for Rel-17 CQI report. |
|  |  |

# Previous discussions

## Applicability

### Issue 1: Applicability

The following are proposed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 8: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 9: Confirm the working assumption to support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure.**  **Proposal 10: For supporting 16-QAM in NPUSCH in PUR procedure, the field multiTone in npusch-MCS in PUR NPUSCH configuration is modified to include MCS 0-21.**  **Proposal 11: Support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 1: Do not support DL 16-QAM during PUR procedure.**  **Proposal 6: Confirm the following working assumption:**   * **Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure.**   **Proposal 7: Include a configuration flag in *PUR-Config* to enable 16-QAM.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 8: 16QAM could not be supported for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.*** |
| [6] | **Proposal 1: Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH/NPDSCH and UE can report CQI in*****PURConfigurationRequest.***  **Proposal 2: The details of related RRC IEs need FFS in RAN2.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption and propose not to support of 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.*** |
| [8] | **Observation 11 The “Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure” is foreseen to be beneficial in some scenarios and straightforward to support, but for DL (i.e., FFS in the WA) the implications are different since it will require for example having to support channel quality reporting in idle-mode.**  **Proposal 8 Confirm the Working Assumption on the “Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure”.** |

For the working assumption on support of 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure, most companies support to confirm it, therefore, the following is proposed:

Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption:

Working Assumption

Support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure.

On the support of 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure, companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB, MTK) propose to support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR, and companies (QC, ZTE, Sanechips, Lenovo, Moto, Ericsson) propose to not support. As this has been discussed for several meeting, the following is proposed to close this topic:

Proposal 2 (conclusion): There’s no consensus to support 16-QAM for NPDSCH in PUR procedure.

With the support of 16-QAM for PUR NPUSCH, companies (Nokia, NSB, ) proposed the corresponding enhancement on the configuration of PUR, therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 3: To support 16-QAM for NPUSCH in PUR procedure,**

* **The RRC IE *multiTone* in *npusch-MCS* in *pur-PhysicalConfig* is extended to indicate MCS from 0 to 21.**
* **One RRC IE is introduced in *pur-PhysicalConfig* to enable the use of 16-QAM.**

Please input your comments on the above proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with proposal 1, proposal 2 and proposal 3. For MCS indicating for PUR PUSCH, it can be up to RAN2 to decide whether to introduce a new IE or extend legacy IE. |
| Ericsson | * Proposal 1: Ok with confirming the WA. * Proposal 2: OK. * Proposal 3: In our view, we can come back to it in a future session in case the WA in proposal 1 becomes confirmed. |
| Lenovo,MotoM | We are fine with the proposal 1-3. |
| MTK | Ok for proposal 1~2.proposal3 should leave to RAN2 to make decision. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with proposal 1 and 2.  For proposal3, we think there is no need to define the parameter details. It can be up to RAN2 discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with proposal 1 and 3  For proposal 2, we feel PUR on NPDSCH can be supported without significant specification impact. Therefore, we would like to also support PUR on NPDSCH. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with proposals 1 and 3. For proposal 2, if CQI is not supported, we would also be OK with supporting 16QAM for DL during PUR. |

## DCI

### Issue 2: DCI design

There are following proposals on power allocation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 1: The deployment is indicated by the legacy signaling *operationmodeInfo, i.e.,* no enhancement is needed on distinguishing the deployment.**  **Proposal 2: Confirm the working assumption for the indication of 16-QAM in uplink.**  **Working Assumption**  For the indication of 16-QAM in uplink   * The “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized as in legacy for scheduling QPSK. * One reserved state in the “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the use of 16QAM. * The “Repetition number” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the TBS indices (i.e., I\_TBS indices from 14 to 21) for 16-QAM in UL.   **Proposal 3: The reserved state to indicate the use of 16QAM in DCI format N0 and DCI format N1 should be “1111”.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 1: UE can determine the deployment mode from the MasterInformationBlock-NB or DL-CarrierConfigDedicated-NB field.**  **Proposal 2: Confirm the working assumption on indication of 16-QAM in uplink from RAN1#105-e.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 2: If the most significant bit of ‘subcarrier indication’ filed is 1, the existing 4-bit MCS field indicates the TBS indices for 16QAM for UL, the QPSK TBS indices otherwise.*** |
| [6] | **Proposal 3: Set two TBS indices columns in the MCS-to-TBS mapping table for SA/GB and IB respectively.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 5: For the DCI format N0 optimization, the joint coding of MCS, repetition number can be considered.*** |
| [8] | **Observation 1 For the “DCI Design for DL”, there is an FFS on “How UE distinguishes the deployment”). During RAN1# 105-e it was mentioned that using the parameter “operationModeInfo” was sufficient to make the distinction between deployment modes, however it was pointed out that it only applies to anchor carriers.**  **Proposal 1 The UE distinguishes the different ranges of TBS indices for “Stand-alone/Guard-band” and “In-band” deployments by re-using the legacy higher layer parameters “operationModeInfo” and “inbandCarrierInfo”.**  **Observation 8 The DCI design agreed for DL can be equally applied for UL, confirming the Working Assumption will allow to have symmetry between UL and DL in terms of DCI design principles.**  **Proposal 6 Confirm the Working Assumption on the DCI design for 16-QAM in UL:**  **For the indication of 16-QAM in uplink**  **- The “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized as in legacy for scheduling QPSK.**  **- One reserved state in the “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the use of 16QAM.**  **- The “Repetition number” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the TBS indices (i.e., I\_TBS indices from 14 to 21) for 16-QAM in UL.** |

Most companies support to confirm the working assumption on indication of 16-QAM in uplink, therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 4: Confirm the working assumption:**

Working Assumption

For the indication of 16-QAM in uplink

* The “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized as in legacy for scheduling QPSK.
* One reserved state in the “Modulation and coding scheme” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the use of 16QAM.
* The “Repetition number” field in DCI Format N0 is utilized to indicate the TBS indices (i.e., I\_TBS indices from 14 to 21) for 16-QAM in UL.

On the FFS relating to distinguishing of deployments, companies proposed to reuse legacy signaling operationModeInfo in MIB and inbandCarrierInfo in SIB for the UE to distinguish the deployments. Therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 5: For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the deployment of the carrier is signaled by *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB.**

Please input your preference and comments to the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 4 and proposal 5. |
| Ericsson | * Proposal 4: Ok with confirming the WA. * Proposal 5: OK. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are fine with proposal 4 and 5 (?). For proposal 5, I am not sure the motivation of the proposal. The deployment of the carrier is signaled in ***operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB** from Rel.13, why do we need the new proposal?  Do we want to clarify the **16-QAM for NPDSCH is supported in non-anchor carrier?** |
| MTK | Ok with proposal4.for proposal5, might be modified like this:  **Proposal 5: For the UE configured with 16-QAM for NPDSCH, the distinguishing of ranges of TBS indices for IB and SA/GB should directly rely on *operationModeInfo* in MIB or *inbandCarrierInfo* in SIB.**  **Alternate1：Set two TBS indices columns in the MCS-to-TBS mapping table for SA/GB and IB respectively** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Proposal 4, we should wait for the conclusion of uplink power control, since the reserved DCI bits under this work assumption would be not enough if dynamic TPC command is supported.  Agree with Proposal 5. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support proposal 4 and 5. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with proposal 4. Proposal 5 seems unnecessary (it should be clear by now how the operation mode is signaled). |

## Power allocation and power control

### Issue 3: downlink power allocation

There are following proposals on power allocation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 6: The working assumption for DL power allocation to support 16QAM for guard-band and standalone deployments should be confirmed.**  **Working Assumption**  For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:   * For standalone and guard-band deployments:   + One power ratio is signaled optionally     - NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS   + The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols.   + If the signaling is not indicated, the legacy power allocation is used.     - i.e., the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE is 0dB for one NRS antenna port, and -3dB for two NRS antenna ports * UE specific signaling is used   **Proposal 7: Support Alt-2 for in-band deployments in the DL power allocation signaling.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 6: Confirm the working assumption on DL power allocation for stand-alone and guard-band deployments from RAN1#105-e.**  **Proposal 7: For in-band deployment, select Alt 1 - the existing parameter nrs-CRS-PowerOffset is reused for same PCI case, and is signaled for different PCI case.** |
| [4] | **Proposal 2:** **Confirm the following working assumption:**  For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:   * **For standalone and guard-band deployments:**   + **One power ratio is signaled optionally**     - **NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS**   + **The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols.**   + **If the signalling is not indicated, the legacy power allocation is used.**     - **i.e., the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE is 0dB for one NRS antenna port, and -3dB for two NRS antenna ports** * **UE specific signalling is used**   **Proposal 3: For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM in in-band deployments, the following option is selected:**   * + **Alt 2:**      - **the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signaled.**   **Proposal 4: For in-band deployments, the power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with NRS is calculated assuming constant power across symbols with NRS and symbols without NRS or CRS.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 3: For downlink power allocation, the working assumptions can be confirmed for standalone and guard-band deployments.***  ***Proposal 4: For downlink power allocation, Alt 1 should be adopted for inband deployment.*** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 3: Confirm the working assumption for DL power allocation for standalone/guardband case.***  ***Proposal 4: To indicate the DL power allocation for inband case, the existing parameter nrs-CRS-PowerOffset is reused for same PCI case, and is signaled for different PCI case.*** |
| [8] | **Proposal 4 Confirm the Working Assumption for the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in Stand-alone and Guard-band deployments.**  **Observation 6 For the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in “In-band deployments”, Alt-2 is not different in terms of complexity, specification impact and nature than what is under Working Assumption for Stand-alone and Guard-band deployments.**  **Observation 7 For the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in “In-band deployments”, Alt-2 is usable regardless of the PCI case. With Alt-2, all deployment modes will all use the same DL power allocation framework based on signalling power ratios.**  **Proposal 5 For the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in “In-band deployments”, Alt-2 is selected:**  **• The power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signaled.**  **• UE specific signaling is used** |

On the working assumption of power allocation for standalone and guardband deployments, most companies propose to confirm it. Therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 6: Confirm the following working assumption:**

Working Assumption

For downlink power allocation to support 16QAM:

* For standalone and guard-band deployments:
  + One power ratio is signaled optionally
    - NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS
  + The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols.
  + If the signalling is not indicated, the legacy power allocation is used.
    - i.e., the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE is 0dB for one NRS antenna port, and -3dB for two NRS antenna ports
* UE specific signalling is used

For the inband deployment, companies (Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sanechips, Lenovo, Moto) support Alt-1, and companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, QC, Ericsson) support alt-2.

One company (QC) raised a concern over Alt-1. As illustrated in the following figures, the CRS, NRS and NPDSCH are power boosted by 3dB compared to LTE PDSCH, i.e., the linear transmit power is 2. The calculated power is shown in Figure 1, which is different with the actual transmission power as shown in Figure 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure 1 Power allocation under Alt.1 (red: CRS, yellow: NPDSCH, green: NRS) – showing only a single symbol of each type**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | Figure 3 Correct power allocation over 2 PRBs, where the PDSCH in LTE PRB is “blanked” and the corresponding power is allocated to NB-IoT NPDSCH/NRS   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NB-IoT PRB | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | “Blanked” LTE PRB | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Figure 2 Nominal power allocation for an RB with PDSCH (red: CRS, orange: PDSCH)   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | | 0.8 | 1 | 1 | |

Please input your comments to the above proposal and the concern over Alt-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 6. For in-band deployment we support Alt-2, and we share similar concern with QC over Alt-1 for in-band DL power allocation. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 6: Ok with confirming the WA.  For In-band, in our understanding some companies seem to think that Alt-2 does not include the assumption on “The same transmit power of different symbols is assumed” and for that reason they seem to be leaning towards Alt-1, however, the assumption made for “Stand-alone and Guard-band” where “The same transmit power is assumed across different symbols” applies for in-band deployments indeed the agreement for In-band deployments already states how the signalling for stand-alone and guard-band (assumption included) is applied in the in-band case:  *“… the signaling for standalone and guard-band deployments … in this case applies to “symbols with NRS” and “symbols without NRS nor CRS”*”  Thus, for the in-band case, we believe is sufficient to agree on the following:  For the downlink power allocation to support 16-QAM in “In-band deployments”, Alt-2 is selected:   * The power ratio between NPDSCH EPRE and NRS EPRE in symbols with CRS is signaled. * UE specific signaling is used |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We still prefer Alt-1  For NBIoT carrier (within 1PRB bandwidth), if different symbols have different receiving power, there will be some performance loss due to improper AGC for UE side.  For QC’s concern, symbol 2 EPRE is signalled by higher layer, symbol 3 EPRE should be derived by assuming the same transmit power between 2 and 3. However, there will be different transmit power for symbol 1 and 2. It seems the design is not aligned.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NB-IoT PRB | 2 | 2 | 2 | |  |  |  | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 6. For in-band deployment, we support Alt-1 to ensure that guardband/standalone and inband deployments have the same assumption with the same transmit power across different symbols. For the mentioned concern on Alt 1, increasing the ratio of NPDSCH EPRE to NRS EPRE in symbols without NRS(agreed) can increase the absolute NPDSCH EPRE of all OFDM symbols to meet decoding requirements. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support proposal 6 |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 6 is OK.  For in-band, let us reply to some of the comments:  “However, there will be different transmit power for symbol 1 and 2. It seems the design is not aligned.”  The transmit power in symbols 1 and 2 are indeed different if you only take into account the NBIOT PRB. If you add the other PRB we show in our contribution, the power is constant (that’s the whole point).  “we support Alt-1 to ensure that guardband/standalone and inband deployments have the same assumption with the same transmit power across different symbols”  The issue with inband is that the eNB cannot “blank” the CRS in the other PRBs, so if CRS is power boosted, NPDSCH needs to be correspondingly de-boosted to keep constant power across the wideband LTE carrier. |

### Issue 4: uplink power control

There are following proposals on uplink power control.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 9：A new term is introduce to support 16QAM in NPUSCH, which reuses the LTE term.**   * **The uplink power control factor is calculated as** |
| [3] | **Proposal 8: A new uplink power control term is introduced in the uplink power control as follows**  **and enabled via RRC configuration. If enabled, the parameter is given in a table based on MCS index. If not enabled, .** |
| [4] | **Proposal 8: For uplink power control, introduce the following specification changes:**   * **Add a correction term in the power control equation.** * **Add a configuration parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*** * **Add the definition of BPRE as in LTE.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 1: For uplink power control, a TPC command could be introduced in DCI format N0 to support 16QAM.***   * ***Repetition number field can be repurpose to indicate TPC command if 16QAM MCS is scheduled.*** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 6: Introduce parameter ΔTF to uplink power control enhancement in NBIoT.*** |
| [8] | **Observation 9 In LTE, the term ΔTF in the power control equation increases the power when the number of bits per RE is increased by a higher order modulation scheme, a similar element has been decided to be incorporated for 16-QAM in UL.**  **Observation 10 The LTE’s term ΔTF has some components that won’t apply for NB-IoT; hence its definition can be simplified as to make it meaningful for NB-IoT.**  **Proposal 7 For the term ΔTF into the uplink power control of NPUSCH using 16-QAM down-select one of the two approaches:**  Alt-1: For 16-QAM in UL based on a simplified equation of legacy LTE, we define ΔTF as follows:  **ΔTF = for *Ks* = 1.25 or ΔTF = 0 for *Ks* = 0.**  **Where *BPRE* =. is the highest code rate in the TBS/MCS table used for the Modulation Scheme, and is the number of bits per *M-ary* symbol of the Modulation Scheme.**  **Alt-2: We define a set of values from which ΔTF is obtained:**  **ΔTF is provided by a HL parameter referring to the following set of values {2dB, 4dB, 6dB, [7dB or 8dB]} “and if this field is absent then dB0 will be used”.** |

On the uplink power control, companies propose to introduce a new term in the power control equation, and there are following options for the determination of the new term:

* Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.
* is given in table based on MCS index if enabled, 0 otherwise.
* A TPC command is introduce to indicate the power offset for NPUSCH with 16-QAM.
* is configured by high layer parameter.
* ΔTF = for *Ks* = 1.25 or ΔTF = 0 for *Ks* = 0, where BPRE =. is the highest code rate in the TBS/MCS table used for the Modulation Scheme, and is the number of bits per M-ary symbol of the Modulation Scheme.

Therefore, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 7: A new term is introduced in the uplink power control to support 16-QAM, which is downselected from following options:**

* Option 1: Reuse the LTE definition simplified for NB-IoT: for and for , where is given by higher layer parameter *deltaMCS-Enabled*, and where K is the code block size.
* Option 2: is given in table based on MCS index if enabled, 0 otherwise.
* Option 3: A TPC command is introduce to indicate the power offset for NPUSCH with 16-QAM.
* Option 4: is configured by high layer parameter.
* Option 5: ΔTF = for *Ks* = 1.25 or ΔTF = 0 for *Ks* = 0, where BPRE =. is the highest code rate in the TBS/MCS table used for the Modulation Scheme, and is the number of bits per M-ary symbol of the Modulation Scheme.

Please input your preference and reasons on the down-selection:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 7 and support option 1, since it is sufficient to follow the LTE principle and seems no need to introduce a different one. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 7:  Question on Option 1, what is the actual result we are getting with option 1?  For Option 5, it is not mentioned that it also re-uses the LTE’s definition, the only simplification is on *BPRE*, which is made dependent on the code rate and modulation scheme as follows: *BPRE* =. Then to determine ΔTF, we calculate first the TF for QPSK and then TF for 16-QAM as to obtain the difference between them (i.e., ΔTF):  TFQPSK = = = 5.9379 dB  TF16-QAM = = = 13.1924 dB  ΔTF = TF16-QAM - TFQPSK = 7.2545 dB  For Option 4, I believe the configured value is selected from a set containing at least a few of possible configurable values, in that case probably is better to add the following: “Option 4: is configured by high layer parameter, 0 otherwise. FFS: values in the set from which is chosen.” |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are OK with proposal 7 and support option 1, since it is sufficient to follow the LTE principle and seems no need to introduce a different one. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 7 and support option3. A TPC command can provide flexible power control. Because the CQI is report ed by MAC CE and NB-IoT UE is a kind of low cost UE, the complicated calculation for ΔTF is not appropriate for NB-IoT. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with proposal 7. Our preference is option 2, which is a simplified version of option 1/5. |
| Qualcomm | We think Option 3 should be removed. The other options can be further discussed. |

## Channel quality reporting

### Issue 5: Channel quality reporting

There are following proposals on power allocation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [2] | **Proposal 4: The CQI reporting in Msg3 in connected mode should not be supported.**  **Proposal 5: Option 3 should be supported for CQI table for downlink 16-QAM CQI reporting.** |
| [3] | **Proposal 3: For 16-QAM CQI table, select one of the following options –**   * **More than three candidate values for 16-QAM are added in the legacy table by replacing candidates with high repetition values (e.g. candidateRep-J to candidateRep-L).** * **A new CQI table is defined for 16-QAM based on the eMTC table (CQI Tables in 36.213) as a starting point**   **Proposal 4: Define CSI reference resource to be used for 16-QAM CQI measurement.**  **Proposal 5: The CSI reference resource is given by a set of the last *R*CSI subframes used for NPDCCH monitoring by the BL/CE UE in the corresponding narrowband before *n*-*nCQI\_ref*.** |
| [5] | ***Observation 1: For Option 1 and 2, the limited number of CQI states with 16QAM cannot adequately match the variety of channel conditions.***  ***Observation 2: For Option 1 and 2, an overhead waste of report field will be caused since NPDCCH CQI entries cannot be applied in the CQI table when NPDSCH CQI report is triggered.***  ***Observation 3: For Option 1, the performance on NPDCCH CQI feedback will be impacted since some legacy entries for number of PDCCH repetitions are removed.***  ***Observation 4:*** ***The channel quality for NPDSCH and NPDCCH can be reported separately based on different tables.***  ***Observation 5: The existing MAC CE can be reused to report 4-bit CQI for NPDSCH if the UE receives a NPDSCH CQI command and 4-bit number of repetitions for NPDCCH if the UE receives a NPDCCH CQI command.***  ***Proposal 5: A separate 4-bit CQI table (similar to CQI tables in 36.213) should be defined for downlink 16QAM.***  ***Proposal 6: CQI report in Msg3 is not supported for 16QAM in connected mode.***  ***Proposal 7: There is no need to specify measurement reference resource for CQI report for NB-IoT 16QAM.*** |
| [6] | **Proposal 4: Support channel quality reporting in Msg3 in connected mode and the details need FFS in RAN2.**  **Proposal 5: A new 4-bit CQI table could be defined for 16-QAM.**  **Proposal 6: CQI for QPSK also needs to be included in the new CQI table.**  **Proposal 7: Introduce 8 CQI indices for 8 TBS indices for 16 QAM as Table 2.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 2: Remove some of the legacy CQI reporting values and add more than 3 CQI reporting values for support 16QAM in DL or report the subset of CQI reporting values determined by channel condition.*** |
| [8] | **Observation 2 The legacy CQI mapping table in TS 36.133 clause 9.1.22.15 currently uses 13 out of 16 entries, hence the three unused fields could be utilized to incorporate the channel quality reporting for 16-QAM in DL.**  **Observation 3 For the TBS/MCS table for DL, the step-size between ITBS indices is in most cases smaller than 1dB, which is a level of granularity that might be unfeasible from a measurement quality perspective. Today the channel quality reporting is specified for each repetition level 1, 2, 4, 8, …, which means that in legacy the step size is 3dB.**  **Observation 4 In Rel-17, the full range of ITBS indices (14 to 21 and 11 to 17 depending on the deployment mode) can be covered using only three candidate reports (i.e., candidateRep-M, candidateRep-N, or candidateRep-O) as to have a feasible level of granularity with step-sizes larger than 1dB.**  **Proposal 2 The three unused entries in the legacy CQI mapping Table in clause 9.1.22.15 of TS 36.133 (i.e., Table 9.1.22.15-1) are used for the CQI reporting of 16-QAM in DL.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Reported value** | **NPDCCH repetition level** | **16-QAM CQI index with NPDSCH transport block error probability not exceeding 0.1** | | candidateRep-M | 1 | 0 | | candidateRep-N | 1 | 1 | | candidateRep-O | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **CQI Index** | **ITBS index** | | |  | **Guard-band and Stand-alone deployments** | **In-band deployments** | | 0 | [17] | [13] | | 1 | [20] | [16] | | 2 | [21] | [17] |   **Observation 5 For the DL channel quality report there is an “FFS on support in Msg3 in connected mode”, nonetheless TS 36.321 states “DL channel quality in Msg3 in RRC\_CONNECTED is not reported”.**  **Proposal 3 For the support of 16-QAM in DL the legacy is followed and the “DL channel quality in Msg3 in RRC\_CONNECTED is not reported”.** |
|  |  |

As most companies propose to not support channel quality report in Msg3 in connected mode, the following is proposed:

**Proposal 8 (conclusion): The channel quality report is not supported in Msg3 in connected mode in Rel-17.**

On the CQI table for downlink 16-QAM, 4 companies (Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Moto) prefer option 1, 1 company (Ericsson) prefers option 2, and 7 companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sanechips, MTK) prefer option 3.

The concerns to support option 1 include: limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting, “dB” step size granularity, increased size of legacy table, no backward compatible, and more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH.

The concerns to support option 2 include: large SNR gap between NPDCCH repetition 1 and 16QAM TBS, more UE complexity on hypothetical decoding of both NPDCCH and NPDSCH, and limited number of MCS entries for 16-QAM for efficient CQI reporting.

The concerns to support option 3 include: no backward compatible, and additional signaling.

For the majority view (option 3), the concerns can be easily addressed by a Rel-17 RRC parameter. If it can be resolved, the following is proposed to move forward based on majority view:

**Proposal 9: For downlink 16-QAM, a new CQI table is defined based on the table 7.2.3-3 in TS 36.213 as a starting point.**

Please input your comments for the above proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with proposal 8 and proposal 9. |
| Ericsson | * Proposal 8: Ok. * Proposal 9: We are not ok with it, mainly because of the no backward compatibility from option 1 and option 3. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are OK with proposal 8  For proposal 9, we have some concern because it is not aligned with the WID  If we use new CQI table, I am not sure which part of the new CQI reporting follows the framework of CQI reporting in Rel.14-16.   * Specify 16-QAM for unicast in UL and DL, including necessary changes to DL power allocation for NPDSCH and DL TBS. This is to be specified without a new NB-IoT UE category. For DL, increase in maximum TBS of e.g. 2x the Rel-16 maximum, and soft buffer size will be specified by modifying at least existing Category NB2. For UL, the maximum TBS is not increased. [NB-IoT] [RAN1, RAN4]   + Extend the NB-IoT channel quality reporting based on the framework of Rel-14—16, to support 16-QAM in DL. [NB-IoT] [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] |
| MTK | For proposal 8, we follow majorities, ok with it. We are also ok with proposal9, regardging Lenovo,MotoM’ concern, the reporting is still a 4-bits table like legacy Release, from the view of framework, we think it doesn’t violate it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Proposal 8 and 9. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Proposal 9. For Proposal 8, although we feel that channel quality reporting in Msg3 would be beneficial, we are OK to proceed with majority view. |

## Others

**Issue 6: Others**

There are also other proposals as below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sourcing | proposals |
| [5] | ***Observation 6: For the large TBS case with QPSK, increasing the mapping RU number while keeping the repetition number reduced half improve performance more than 2 dB.***  ***Proposal 9: For NB-IoT UE with 16QAM, double RU number should be considered to improve the performance for some QPSK entries with the repetition number reduced half.*** |
| [9] | **Observation 1: The PAPR of 16-QAM for DL NB-IoT is increased compared with QPSK.**  **Proposal 1: RAN1 to consider the reduction of 16-QAM PAPR for DL NB-IoT.** |
| [10] | **Observation 1 The WI on “Additional enhancements for NB-IoT and LTE-MTC” is coming to its end and there are two tasks that need to be started promptly (e.g., after RAN1# 106-e):**  **• An overall initial identification of specification impacts on a per agreement basis.**  **• Initiate the identification of the required RRC parameters per WI objective lead by RAN1 as to create the “Rel-17 RRC parameter list”.**  **Observation 2 In our view, the overall initial identification of specification impacts on a per agreement basis can be carried out in parallel with the RRC parameter list.** |

Please input any issue that can be considered for discussion in this meeting:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Ericsson | From other topics, we believe the following proposal in [3] is important to discuss: “Proposal 4: Define CSI reference resource to be used for 16-QAM CQI measurement.” |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It is worth to mention that for the large TBS case with QPSK, increasing the mapping RU number while keeping the repetition number reduced half improve performance more than 2 dB. Therefore, for NB-IoT UE with 16QAM, double RU number should be considered to improve the performance for some QPSK entries with the repetition number reduced half. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with Ericsson that we should discuss the issue of CSI reference resource. |
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